



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Eumenides of Aeschylus, with Introduction and Notes by
A. SIDGWICK, M. A. Third Edition. Oxford, 1902.

Teachers of the classics are familiar with Mr. Sidgwick's editions of the Orestean trilogy. That these have proved a valuable introduction to the study of Aeschylus, needs neither statement nor argument. Assuming that this series of text-books has a future as well as a past, it may be worth while to offer some remarks, based upon class-room experience, concerning the third edition of the Eumenides.

The editor has done well to omit the asterisks which formerly marked deviations from the manuscript readings and to give in their place adequate critical notes. In the revision of the punctuation, the third edition does not seem to mark an improvement over the second. Cases in point are the insertion of a comma in 690, its omission in 807, the substitution of colon for comma in 408. After 830, the comma does not bear out the interpretation given in the note. The entire absence of punctuation after 1028 is evidently an oversight, as is also the false form *αἰμητηρόν*, 137.

Concerning the notes, the following comments may be made. The expression in vs. 30 is not an abridgment of two constructions but a survival of the ablative genitive. "Reckoning from my former entrances, may this response be the best." This is an epic construction (*Iliad* 1, 505, etc.), and is used by Thucydides 1, 1, *Soph. Antig.* 102, 1212. To translate *ἐφῆσω*, 502, "let loose," or with Liddell and Scott, "send upon", is to attribute too much to the Furies. They do not threaten to promote murder, but give warning that if their power is broken murder will take its unchecked course. Their part is permissive. The translation of 503-5 is lacking in clearness. In 661 Mr. Sidgwick seems to make *ἔπος* the antecedent of *οἰσι*. The dative case is against this interpretation. The pronoun is a dative of interest, and the logical antecedent is *ὁ θρόσκων*. A note explaining the prevalence of this theory of parentage would be welcome. The sequence of thought in 826-8 is not correctly given in the note. There is nothing adversative in these verses. When Athena says, "I have trust in Zeus," she means not in his wisdom and justice but in his power. The chorus had threatened violence. Athena replies: You talk of force. I too have an appeal to force. I know where the thunderbolt of Zeus is kept. But we need not appeal to force.

A general note prefixed to the passage 711-730 would be helpful to the young student. Antithesis is the key to the understanding

of this balanced debate whose component parts are a word by the chorus and a retort by Apollo. Verses 731-733, spoken by the chorus, mark the conclusion of the debate. The context, then, indicates that the relation between 731 and 732 is something as follows: Since you flout me, I will wait for the decision and have no further words with you.

The verses from 734 to 753 have been a battle ground of interpreters. Mr. Sidgwick adopts the view of Müller, that Athena does not actually vote for Orestes until after the votes of the judges have been counted and found even for condemnation and acquittal. The logic of this position is that the goddess does, essentially, but one thing toward the acquittal. She makes a ruling, vs. 741, to cover the contingency of a tie vote. Her vote does nothing new in principle but merely puts in concrete form the abstract doctrine that the accused goes free, not only if he have a majority but even if he have the same number of votes as are given for conviction. Mr. Sidgwick admits that it appears at first that Athena actually votes. His reasons for accepting the other view are not exegetical but are found in certain general considerations: e. g. "This would make the court an odd number." Yet the number of the judges is nowhere given, and the number 12 for which Müller contends is nothing more than an inference that has never commanded general assent. The theory of the symbolism of this scene has a like foundation. The question is whether the gods, Athena and Zeus, to whom Orestes attributes his deliverance, take no more active part than to ordain that in cases of doubt mercy shall prevail. Against this view are the repeated references to Zeus as the real sponsor both for the act of Orestes and for his acquittal. To the authority of Zeus both Athena and Apollo make appeal: cf. vss. 19, 616 ff., 797 ff., 826 ff. Further, that Athena herself finally takes sides and declares for Orestes appears from the passage now under consideration. In vs. 734 she says that it is her part *λοισθίαν κρίναι δίκην*. Then holding up a ballot she announces that she will cast it for Orestes. This declaration is followed by five verses introduced by *γάρ*. The purpose and content of these verses are of importance. The goddess gives therein her reasons for preferring the cause of Orestes. After this statement comes vs. 741, containing the ruling for the contingency of a tie vote. Müller held that the five explanatory verses lead up to 741 and explain it. He translates 741 accordingly: "Drum siegt Orestes auch bei gleicher Stimmenzahl." But to find causal coordination in *δέ* is impossible since 736-740 have already been brought into relation to 735 by means of *γάρ*. In other words, the explanation explains the vote, not the ruling, and the voting and ruling are two distinct things. Moreover the phrase *κρίναι δίκην* describes the act of a judge and means, to pass upon the case. The expression is so used in 433, 468 and 682. Athena, then, takes sides and votes. She does for the acquittal of Orestes two distinct things: she votes and she

rules. Her vote is cast before the count. The objection has been often raised that Athena had declared in vss. 471 f. that she herself might not decide the case. Hermann answered by saying that she might refuse to be the sole judge and yet act as one of a number of judges. It may be added that the declaration of Athena needs to be interpreted in the light of the rest of the play. Mortals actually do pass upon the case, although Athena has said at first that the matter is too great for them; and the goddess actually votes. The institution of a court, divinely appointed and destined for all time, is something new, and transcends the objections which at first seemed to forbid the rendering of any decision at Athens.

The question of a change of scene in a Greek tragedy is one of importance. In the *Eumenides* that question is not only important but is beset with difficulties. That the scene changes after 234 from Delphi to Athens needs no proof. In a note to 235 Mr. Sidgwick indicates that the temple of Athena Polias on the Acropolis is the place of action. Further, on p. 8 of the introduction and in the notes to vss. 687, 918 and 1024 a second change of scene from the Acropolis to the Areopagus is assumed. Many English works of reference agree with Mr. Sidgwick that the trial takes place on the Areopagus; which is equivalent to saying that there are two changes of scene in the *Eumenides*. There are, however, certain facts in the play itself which make this hypothesis difficult to accept, and it may fairly be said that recent discussions of the point in question have made the hypothesis untenable. These facts and a summary of these discussions will now be given.

The references to the image and shrine of Athena in vss. 80, 242 and 440 point unmistakably to the Acropolis. If the scene afterwards is the Areopagus, the change must take place between 489 and 566. But in 487-8, upon her departure to select the judges, Athena says, *κρίνασα . . . ἤξω*; which means that she will return, not that she will proceed with her court to some place of which no hint is given. The continued presence of the chorus must be taken for granted. No pretext for their absence can be found between 489 and the end of the play. This fact raises a presumption against any change. And yet, in vss. 685 ff. the Areopagus is plainly indicated as the scene by the use of the pronouns *τόνδ'*, *τήνδ'*. From this point to the end of the play, the single passage to which one can appeal is that which describes the escort of the *Eumenides* to their new home. The reference, in 1024 ff., to the attendants who care for the shrine of the goddess and who are to form a part of the procession is most naturally explained upon the supposition that the scene is still before the temple of Athena on the Acropolis. The situation, then, for the play as a whole is this, that from verse 235 to the end all the facts indicate the Acropolis, excepting only the passage beginning with vs. 685. This isolated passage speaks for the Areopagus.

The expectation of the modern reader of the play is that when the court of the Areopagus is to be founded, the act of founding will take place on the Areopagus. This isolated passage, reinforced by the reader's natural expectation, has led to the view that there is a second change of scene. This is evidently the view of Mr. Sidgwick, although he nowhere indicates at what point the change occurs.

There is another view that may be thus formulated: this isolated passage which points to the Areopagus may not be used as a standard but must be brought into harmony with its environment. Müller endeavored to attain this end by interpretation. He held that the Areopagus was so represented on one of the periacti that it could be pointed out by the goddess, and that the phrase *πόλιν νεόπολιν τῇδ'* referred to the Acropolis. The grammatical impossibility of this interpretation was pointed out by Hermann, and the supposition that periacti were a part of the Aeschylean theatre can no longer be maintained. Weil has held that the trial takes place upon the Acropolis but that the actor steps forward and points to the actual Areopagus. Wecklein cuts the knot by classing the passage with certain others that are, in his judgment, the work of a later hand. The third way of meeting the situation is by emending the two deictic pronouns which are the real seat of the difficulty. Paley and Kirchhoff suggest *τῇδ'*, which makes it possible to refer *πόλιν νεόπολιν* to the Areopagus and still to find in the text the needed reference to the Acropolis. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has taken the next step by reading for *τόνδ', οὐδ'*. This emendation provides for the accusative *πάγον* and brings the whole passage into harmony with the rest of the play. It removes the last exegetical reason for saying that the scene changes a second time and that the trial takes place on the Areopagus. It should be observed that cumulative evidence points to this passage as the seat of a textual error. Those who still maintain that the text is sound and that the scene is actually on the Areopagus, are bound to deal with the entire body of evidence which the play presents. Mr. Sidgwick refers in his preface to the *Griechische Tragoedien* by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. The German scholar's prior and more important discussion of the Eumenides is to be found where one would not ordinarily seek it, in Vol. II of *Aristoteles und Athen*, Berlin, 1893. This incisive piece of dramatic criticism, which maintains the essential integrity of the text and proceeds always from a keen interpretation of the text, leaves at the door of every editor of the Eumenides the duty and privilege of rethinking many of the oft-debated questions which this drama suggests.

In conclusion the opinion may be expressed that this series of books is incomplete without some treatment of the metres. The state of the text often makes this a difficult task, but at no one point can the editor more effectively help the teacher.